



Tupelo Mississippi
Planning & Environmental Study
Railroad Relocation

FINAL

Tupelo Railroad Relocation Planning & Environmental Study

**Phase 1 – Feasibility Analysis
Volume I – Report**

May 2006

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I – Report

Table of Contents	i
Index of Figures	v
Index of Tables	viii
1.0 Executive Summary	1-1
2.0 Introduction	2-1
2.1 Purpose.....	2-3
2.1.1 Data Collection.....	2-3
2.1.2 Rail Traffic Analysis.....	2-6
2.1.3 Traffic Delay Analysis.....	2-6
2.1.4 Operational Improvements.....	2-6
2.1.5 In-Town Alternative.....	2-6
2.1.6 Alternative Alignments.....	2-7
2.2 Additional Considerations.....	2-7
3.0 Relevant Studies & Articles	3-1
3.1 Urban Rail Relocations Study, 2002.....	3-1
3.1.1 Route Selection.....	3-1
3.1.2 Cost Estimate.....	3-3
3.1.3 Conclusion.....	3-3
3.2 Wellspring Project, 2004.....	3-3
3.2.1 Transportation Improvements.....	3-4
3.2.2 Conclusion.....	3-4
3.3 Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal Articles.....	3-5
3.3.1 Emergency Responders.....	3-5
3.3.2 Safety Concerns.....	3-5
3.3.3 Traffic Delay.....	3-5
3.3.4 Summary.....	3-5
4.0 Existing Conditions	4-1
4.1 Railroads.....	4-1
4.1.1 Rail Characteristics.....	4-3
4.1.1.1 Physical Plant.....	4-3
4.1.1.2 Track Vertical Geometry.....	4-4
4.1.1.3 Track Horizontal Geometry.....	4-4
4.1.1.4 Right-of-Way.....	4-4

4.1.1.5	Operating Speed.....	4-5
4.1.1.6	Rail Traffic.....	4-5
4.1.2	Train Accident Data.....	4-6
4.2	Roadway Crossings.....	4-7
4.2.1	Grade-Separated.....	4-7
4.2.2	At-Grade Crossings.....	4-7
4.2.3	At-Grade Crossing Accident Data.....	4-8
4.3	Proposed Improvements In the Region.....	4-9
4.3.1	Proposed Developments.....	4-9
4.3.2	Roadway Improvements.....	4-11
4.3.2.1	Committed Primary Federal/State Highways.....	4-11
4.3.2.2	Committed Secondary State Highways.....	4-11
4.3.2.3	Committed City Streets.....	4-11
4.4	Natural and Biological Features.....	4-12
4.4.1	FEMA Floodplain.....	4-12
4.4.2	National Wetlands Inventory.....	4-12
4.4.3	Environmentally Sensitive Areas.....	4-12
4.4.4	Mississippi State Parks.....	4-17
4.4.5	Natchez Trace Parkway.....	4-17
4.5	Cultural Features and Community Services.....	4-17
4.5.1	Historical & Archeological Sites.....	4-17
4.5.2	Hazardous Materials Sites.....	4-17
4.5.3	Community Services.....	4-20
4.5.4	Recreational Facilities.....	4-22
4.5.5	Utilities.....	4-22
5.0	Design Criteria.....	5-1
6.0	Train Volumes.....	6-1
6.1	Existing Rail Traffic.....	6-1
6.1.1	BNSF Traffic.....	6-1
6.1.2	KCS Traffic.....	6-1
6.2	Future Rail Traffic.....	6-1
6.2.1	Methodology.....	6-3
6.2.2	BNSF Traffic.....	6-3
6.2.3	KCS Traffic.....	6-3
6.3	Summary.....	6-3
7.0	At-Grade Auto Traffic Delay Analysis.....	7-1
7.1	Description of Crossings.....	7-1
7.2	Traffic Delay Analyses.....	7-1
7.2.1	Data Collection and Process.....	7-4
7.2.1.1	Data Source.....	7-4
7.2.1.2	Highway Data.....	7-4

7.2.1.3	Rail Data.....	7-13
7.2.2	Delay Analysis.....	7-17
7.2.2.1	Maximum Queue, Q_{max}	7-17
7.2.2.2	Delay.....	7-18
7.2.2.3	Cost of Congestion.....	7-19
7.2.2.4	Level of Service.....	7-19
7.3	Traffic Delay Results.....	7-21
7.3.1	Cost of Congestion at the At-grade Crossing Locations.....	7-21
7.3.2	Cost of Congestion at the Near-by Intersections.....	7-31
7.4	Summary of At-Grade Crossing Traffic Delay Study.....	7-42
7.5	General Conclusions.....	7-45
8.0	Alternatives.....	8-1
8.1	Operational Improvements.....	8-1
8.1.1	Existing Operations.....	8-1
8.1.2	Proposed Improvements.....	8-1
8.2	In Town Alternative.....	8-3
8.2.1	Scenario 1.....	8-4
8.2.2	Scenario 2.....	8-4
8.3	Initial Alignment Determination.....	8-6
8.3.1	Typical Rail Section.....	8-6
8.3.2	Corridor Width.....	8-6
8.3.3	Basis for Proposed Alignment Creation.....	8-6
8.3.3.1	Developing Least-Cost Path Ranking Criteria.....	8-8
8.3.3.2	GRID Overlay Methodology.....	8-8
8.3.3.3	Least-Cost Path Analysis.....	8-10
8.3.3.4	Corridor Generation & Reduction Process.....	8-11
8.4	Alternative Alignments.....	8-11
8.4.1	Alignment A.....	8-13
8.4.2	Alignment B.....	8-15
8.4.3	Alignment C.....	8-17
8.4.4	Alignment D.....	8-19
8.4.5	Alignment E.....	8-22
8.4.6	Impacts to Railroad Operations.....	8-24
8.4.6.1	Methodology.....	8-24
8.4.6.2	Results.....	8-25
8.4.6.3	Travel Time.....	8-25
8.4.7	Corridor Abandonment.....	8-26
8.5	Evaluation Analysis.....	8-27
8.5.1	Evaluation Measures.....	8-27
8.5.2	Impact Summary.....	8-27
8.5.3	At-Grade Traffic Conflict.....	8-29
8.5.3.1	Existing Conditions.....	8-29
8.5.3.2	At-Grade Intersection Closures.....	8-29

	8.5.3.3 Proposed At-Grade Intersection Construction.....	8-29
8.6	Cost Analysis.....	8-32
8.6.1	Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate.....	8-32
8.6.2	Operating Costs.....	8-33
8.6.3	At-Grade Crossing Maintenance.....	8-34
9.0	Conclusion.....	9-1
9.1	Summary of Analysis.....	9-1
9.2	Recommendation.....	9-3

GLOSSARY OF RAILROAD TERMS

APPENDICES

Appendix A –	Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal Articles
Appendix B –	E+C Highway Network Technical Memorandum
Appendix C –	Utility Services Technical Memorandum
Appendix D –	Current Railroad Operations Technical Memorandum
Appendix E –	Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum
Appendix F –	Feasibility of “In-Town” Alternative Technical Memorandum
Appendix G –	Alternative Alignment Detailed Construction Cost Estimates

VOLUME II – Alternative Alignment Concept Plans

INDEX OF FIGURES

<u>Figure No.</u>	<u>Figure Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
2-1	Location Map	2-2
2-2	Study Area.....	2-4
3-1	“Urban Rail Relocation” Alignments 2002.....	3-2
3-2	Wellspring Conceptual Layout.....	3-4
4-1	Study Area.....	4-2
4-2	Train Accidents Per County.....	4-6
4-3	Motorized Vehicle/Train Collisions at At-Grade Crossings Per County.....	4-9
4-4	Wellspring Conceptual Layout.....	4-10
4-5	Committed Roadways.....	4-13
4-6	FEMA Floodplains.....	4-14
4-7	Wetlands.....	4-15
4-8	Environmentally Sensitive Areas	4-16
4-9	Archeological / Historical Areas and Sites.....	4-18
4-10	Hazardous Material Sites.....	4-19
4-11	Community Services.....	4-21
4-12	Utilities.....	4-24
7-1	At-Grade Crossing Location and Crossing ID.....	7-3
7-2	AADT Count Stations and ID.....	7-6
7-3	Traffic Growth Trend.....	7-9

7-4	Train Traffic Distribution Illustration in the Year 2005.....	7-14
7-5	Train Operating Speed in the Tupelo Study Area.....	7-16
7-6	Relationship of Delay, Waiting Time, and Queuing Length.....	7-17
7-7	2005 PM Peak Hour Crossing Level of Service (Without Switching Operation).....	7-27
7-8	2005 PM Peak Hour Crossing Level of Service (With Switching Operation).....	7-28
7-9	2030 PM Peak Hour Crossing Level of Service (Without Switching Operation).....	7-29
7-10	2030 PM Peak Hour Crossing Level of Service (With Switching Operation).....	7-30
7-11	Year 2005 PM Peak Hour BNSF Train Crossing Eason Blvd at Ryder Street.....	7-38
7-12	Year 2030 PM Peak Hour BNSF Train Crossing Gloster St. at Main St. & Park St. at Jefferson St.....	7-39
7-13	Year 2030 PM Peak Hour BNSF Train Crossing Elizabeth St. at Spring St.....	7-40
7-14	Year 2030 PM Peak Hour KCS Train Crossing Front St. at Main St. & Park St. at Jefferson St.....	7-41
8-1	Operational Improvement.....	8-2
8-2	In-Town Alternative Scenario 1.....	8-5
8-3	In-Town Alternative Scenario 2.....	8-5
8-4	Rail Typical Sections.....	8-7
8-5	Least Cost Path Alignments.....	8-12
8-6	Alignment A.....	8-14
8-7	Alignment B.....	8-16
8-8	Alignment C.....	8-18

8-9	Alignment D.....	8-20
8-10	Alignment E.....	8-23
8-11	Traffic Conflict Removed.....	8-31
8-12	Traffic Conflict Added.....	8-31
8-13	Overall Traffic Conflict Removed.....	8-32

INDEX OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Table Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
5-1	Rail Design Criteria.....	5-1
5-2	Roadway Design Criteria.....	5-3
7-1	At-Grade Crossing ID Chart.....	7-2
7-2	Daily Time Periods.....	7-4
7-3	20-Year Historical AADT Data Provided by MDOT.....	7-5
7-4	ANOVA Table of Regression Analysis for Traffic Projection.....	7-8
7-5	At-Grade Crossing Roadway Characteristics.....	7-10
7-6	Peak-to-Daily Ratio (p/d).....	7-12
7-7	Assumed Percentage of Heavy Trucks.....	7-13
7-8	Adjusted Percentage of Heavy Trucks.....	7-13
7-9	Train Traffic Distribution (In the Year 2004-2030).....	7-15
7-10	Signalized Intersection LOS vs. Delay.....	7-20
7-11	Un-signalized Intersection LOS vs. Delay.....	7-20
7-12	Total At-Grade Crossing Cost of Congestion from 2005 to 2030.....	7-22
7-13	Rank of At-Grade Crossing by Highest Total Daily Delay (veh-hr)....	7-22
7-14	Current Year of 2005 At-Grade Crossing Cost of Congestion.....	7-24
7-15	Future Year of 2030 At-Grade Crossing Cost of Congestion.....	7-25
7-16	Year 2005 and Year 2030 At-Grade Crossing Average Delay and LOS in PM Peak Hour.....	7-26

7-17	Overall Near-by Intersections Network Performance Simulation Results B.....	7-31
7-18	Year 2005 Near-by Intersections Delay and LOS in PM Peak Hour.....	7-32
7-19	Year 2030 Near-by Intersections Delay and LOS in PM Peak Hour.....	7-33
7-20	Current Year of 2005 Near-by Intersections Cost of Congestion.....	7-35
7-21	Future Year of 2030 Near-by Intersections Cost of Congestion.....	7-36
7-22	From Current Year 2005 to Future Year 2030 Near-by Intersections Cost of Congestion.....	7-37
7-23	Summary of Level of Service at the At-Grade Crossings in the Year 2005 and Year 2030 during PM Peak Hour.....	7-43
7-24	Summary of Level of Service for the Near-by Intersections during PM Peak Hour in the Year 2005 and Year 2030.....	7-44
7-25	Annual Cost of Congestion for Year 2005 and Year 2030.....	7-44
7-26	Cumulative Cost of Congestion from Year 2005 to Year 2030.....	7-44
8-1	Ranking of Input Layers for Least-Cost Path Analysis.....	8-9
8-2	Alternative Weights for Least-Cost Path Models.....	8-10
8-3	Alignment A Right-of-Way.....	8-15
8-4	Alignment B Right-of-Way.....	8-17
8-5	Alignment C Right-of-Way.....	8-19
8-6	Alignment D Right-of-Way.....	8-21
8-7	Alignment E Right-of-Way.....	8-24
8-8	Net Train-miles Change.....	8-25
8-9	Total Annual Change in Train-miles (2030).....	8-25

8-10	Travel Time (minutes).....	8-26
8-11	BNSF Corridor Abandonment.....	8-26
8-12	Alternative Evaluation Measures	8-28
8-13	Existing At-Grade Traffic Conflict.....	8-30
8-14	Alternatives Cost Summary	8-34
8-15	Additional Annual Operating Costs (2030 Rail Volumes in 2005 Dollars)	8-34
8-16	Annual Maintenance Cost.....	8-35
9-1	Cumulative Cost of Congestion from Year 2005 to Year 2030.....	9-1